1		
2		
3		
4		
5		·
6		
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
8	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE	
9		
10	KATHERINE MOUSSOURIS,	CASE NO. C15-1483JLR
11	Plaintiff,	ORDER
12	V.	
13	MICROSOFT CORPORATION,	
14	Defendant.	
15	Before the court is Special Master Michelle Peterson's report and recommendation	
16	on various motions to seal (Dkt. ## 366, 375, 393, 414, 421, 435). (See R&R (Dkt.	
17	# 462).) Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 53(f), the court must decide de novo	
18	all objections to the findings of fact or conclusions of law made or recommended by a	
19	special master. Fed. R. Civ. P. 53(f)(3)-(4). Here, neither party objects to any of Ms.	
20	Peterson's recommendations. (See Dkt.; see also R&R at 38 (allowing parties to file	
21	objections, if any, no later than April 26, 2018).) The court has reviewed Ms. Peterson's	
22	report and recommendation in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 53(f), the	

2 3 4

parties' submissions related to the report and recommendation, the relevant portions of the record, and the applicable law. Having done so, the court finds Ms. Peterson's reasoning persuasive in light of the record and independently reaches the same conclusions for the reasons Ms. Peterson articulates.

The court notes that on April 26, 2018, Ms. Peterson filed a supplemental report and recommendation that clarifies the issue of redacting information regarding non-party individuals. (*See* Supp. R&R (Dkt. # 468) at 1-2.) The supplemental report and recommendation also corrects three clerical errors regarding redactions of Microsoft employee names. (*Id.* at 2.) Because this supplemental report and recommendation was not issued until April 26, 2018, the parties were given until May 1, 2018, to file any objections to the specific issues—and only those issues—contained within the supplemental report and recommendation. (*See id.* at 5.)

Accordingly, the court ADOPTS the report and recommendation, except insofar as it involves the items addressed by the supplemental report and recommendation.

Additionally, as the report and recommendation suggests, the court ORDERS the following:

(1) With respect to Microsoft's Amended Motion to Seal documents filed in support of its motion for summary judgment (Dkt. # 414), Microsoft may, but is not required to, submit a revised proposed order on redactions to the following exhibits: the Moussouris Deposition (Dkt. # 402-9), the Muenchow Deposition (Dkt. # 402-10), and the Piermarini Deposition (Dkt. # 402-11).

(See R&R at 11.) If Microsoft chooses to file a revised proposed order, it must	
do so within five (5) days of the entry of this order.	
(2) The court DIRECTS the parties to jointly submit, within ten (10) days of the	
entry of this order, a stipulated reference sheet that details—by title and docket	
number—the documents that the parties rely on for the Motion for Class	
Certification (Dkt. ## 228 (sealed), 232 (redacted)) and the Motion for	
Summary Judgment (Dkt. # 418).	
Dated this 29 day of April, 2018.	
I was a second	
JAMES L ROBART United States District Judge	